

California State Fire Marshal

**Hazardous Liquid Pipeline
Risk Assessment**



Pete Wilson
Governor

Sandra R. Smoley
Secretary, State and Consumer
Service Agency

Ronny J. Coleman
State Fire Marshal



We are pleased to present this Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Risk Assessment Study and hope that it will be useful to pipeline operators, governmental regulators and public policy-makers at all levels.

The genesis of this work was two State laws passed in 1989: AB 385 authored by Assembly-member Dave Elder, and SB 268 by Senator Herschel Rosenthal. These two bills were introduced in the aftermath of a deadly pipeline rupture and fire which occurred in San Bernardino, California. These laws called for differing studies of hazardous liquid pipeline failures vis-a-vis various risk factors. The called-for studies are combined in this document.

This report is based on 10 years (1981-1990) of pipeline failure/leak data in California. We are highly indebted to the operators of liquid pipelines in California, without whose time-consuming efforts and cooperation this report would not exist. A more specific acknowledgment of these operators is at the back of the report. Providing key and valued guidance throughout the life of this project were members of the Pipeline Safety Advisory Committee.

We also would like to thank our consultant on the project, EDM Services, and Brian Payne who was lead author of this report.

For more information concerning the State Fire Marshal's Pipeline Safety Program, please contact:

CDF/State Fire Marshal
Pipeline Safety Division
PO Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460
916/445-8477

**California State Fire Marshal
Pipeline Safety Advisory Committee**

Joan Jennings, Chair
Deputy Chief
California State Fire Marshal

Dave Elder
Past Assemblyman
Author of California Pipeline Safety Act

Jim Hilliard
Insurance Agent
State Farm Insurance Company

Chris Hunter
Fire Chief
Long Beach Fire Department

James Nowinski
Manager, Pipeline Engineering
Unocal Pipeline

Ken Peterson
Supervisor, 4th District
Kern County

Bob Wilson
Chief
Santa Fe Springs Fire Department

David Wright
Vice President, Western Region
GATX Terminals Corporation

Jerry Englehardt (Past Member)
Vice President Engineering
Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline

Jack Woycheese (Past Member)
Principal
Gage-Babcock and Associates

Matt Rezavani (Technical Advisor)
Consultant
Arco Transportation Company

James Wait, Staff
Division Chief
California State Fire Marshal

**California State Fire Marshal
Staff Acknowledgements**

Joan Jennings
Deputy Director

James Wait
Division Chief

Charles J. Samo
Supervising Pipeline Safety Engineer

Robert G. Gorham
Project Coordinator

Notice

This document was prepared by EDM Services, Inc., under contract to the California State Fire Marshal. Data was furnished by the pipeline operators. EDM Services, Inc., the California State Fire Marshal, and their staffs do not:

- warrant the accuracy or completeness of the data collected, nor
- assume any liability resulting from the use of, or damage resulting from any information presented herein.

EDM Services, Inc. and the California State Fire Marshal do not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the objectives of this study.

California State Fire Marshal

**Hazardous Liquid Pipeline
Risk Assessment**

March 1993

This study was conducted and this document was prepared by:

EDM Services, Inc.
40 West Cochran, Suite 112
Simi Valley, California 93065
Telephone (805) 527-3300
FAX (805) 583-1607



California State Fire Marshal
Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Risk Assessment

Contents

Executive Summary	8
1.0 Introduction	12
1.1 Regulatory Authority	12
1.2 Circumstantial History	13
1.3 Relative Safety Perspective	14
1.4 Acknowledgements	18
2.0 Methodology	20
2.1 Contracting	20
2.2 Pipeline Operator Notification	22
2.3 Key Contact List and Preliminary Questionnaire	22
2.4 In-House Mapping and Background Information	23
2.5 Data Gathering Guideline	25
2.6 Gather Railroad and Public Utilities Commission Data	25
2.7 Conduct Pilot Surveys	26
2.8 Gather Data From Remaining Operating Companies	27
2.9 Statistical Analysis	28
2.10 Potential Data Inconsistencies	28
3.0 Background Pipeline Risk Data	30
3.1 CONCAWE - 1981 Through 1989	30
3.2 U.S. Natural Gas Transmission and Gathering Lines, 1970 Through June 1984	32
3.3 U.S. Natural Gas Transmission and Gathering Lines, June 1984 through 1988	34
3.4 U.S. Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Accidents, 1986 through 1989	36
3.5 Summary California Regulated Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Data - 1981 through 1990	38
3.6 Comparison of Various Incident Data Sources	38
3.7 Uncorrected Pipeline Risks	43
4.0 General Risk Levels	44
4.1 Overall Incident Causes	45
4.2 Interstate versus Intrastate Pipelines	47
4.3 Common Carrier versus Non-Common Carrier Lines	50
4.4 Incident Rates By Pipeline Contents	53
4.5 Incident Rates By Study Year	55



California State Fire Marshal

March 1993

Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Risk Assessment

4.6	Railroad Effect	60
4.7	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's)	62
4.8	Decade of Construction Effects	64
4.9	Operating Temperature Effects	68
4.10	Pipe Diameter Effects	72
4.11	Leak Detection Systems	76
4.12	Cathodic Protection System	78
4.13	Pipe Specification Effects	83
4.14	Pipe Type Effects	83
4.15	Operating Pressure Effects	86
4.16	External Pipe Coatings	90
4.17	High Risk Pipelines	93
4.18	Internal Inspections	99
4.19	Seasonal Effects	101
4.20	Leaking Component	101
4.21	Hydrostatic Testing Interval	104
4.22	Spill Size Distribution	108
4.23	Damage Distribution	111
4.24	Stress Level Distribution	111
4.25	Injuries and Fatalities	114
4.26	Multiple Logit Regression Analyses	118
5.0	Seismic Activity Effect	122
5.1	Observed Damage	123
5.2	Observed Leak Rate	125
5.3	Future Seismic Activity	132
5.4	Expected Seismic Incidents	134
6.0	Block Valve Effectiveness	142
6.1	Continued Pumping	142
6.2	Fluid Decompression	144
6.3	Drain Down	145
6.4	Spill Components Affected By Block Valves	147
6.5	Block Valve Effectiveness Data	148
6.6	Cost Benefit Analysis	155
6.7	Cost Benefit Analysis - HVL Lines	162
6.8	Emergency Flow Restricting Devices	163
7.0	Local Fire Agency Notification	166
7.1	Questionnaire Development	166
7.2	Operators' Responses	167
7.3	Fire Departments' Responses	168



8.0	Conclusions	170
8.1	Significant Findings	170
8.2	Less Significant Findings	175
9.0	Recommendations	178
10.0	Bibliography	180



List of Tables

Table 1-1	Fatalities by Mode of Transportation	15
Table 1-2	Estimated 1988 Fatalities Associated with Revenue Freight	17
Table 1-3	Estimated 1988 Fatalities Per Billion Ton-Miles Transported	17
Table 3-1	European Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Incidents, 1981 through 1989	31
Table 3-2	U.S. Natural Gas Transmission and Gathering Lines, Reportable Incidents, 1970 through June 1984	33
Table 3-3	Onshore U.S. Natural Gas Transmission and Gathering Lines, Reportable Incidents, June 1984 through 1988	35
Table 3-4	U.S. Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Accidents, Reportable Incidents, 1986 through 1989	37
Table 3-5	California Regulated Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Data, 1981 through 1990	39
Table 3-6	Comparison of Various Incident Data Sources	41
Table 4-1	Overall Incident Causes	46
Table 4-2	Interstate versus Intrastate Pipelines	49
Table 4-3	Common Carrier versus Non-Common Carrier Pipelines	52
Table 4-4	Incidents By Pipeline Contents	54
Table 4-5	Incident Rates By Year of Study	56
Table 4-6	Railroad Effect	61
Table 4-7	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas	63
Table 4-8	Incident Rates By Decade of Construction	65
Table 4-9	Incident Rates By Normal Operating Temperature	69
Table 4-10	Incident Rates By Pipe Diameter	73
Table 4-11	Incidents By Leak Detection System	77
Table 4-12	Cathodic Protection System	79
Table 4-12A	Average Cathodic Protection Survey Interval During Study Period	82
Table 4-13	Incidents By Pipe Specification	84
Table 4-14	Incident Rates By Pipe Type	85
Table 4-15	Incident Rates By Normal Operating Pressure	87
Table 4-16	Incident Rates By Coating Type	91
Table 4-17	High Risk versus Non-High Risk Pipelines	94
Table 4-17A	Incident Rates By Year of Study - High Risk Pipelines Only	96
Table 4-18	Incidents By Internal Inspections	100
Table 4-19	Incident Rates By Month of Year	102
Table 4-20	Incidents By Item Which Leaked	103
Table 4-21	Average Hydrostatic Testing Interval During Study Period	106
Table 4-21A	Time Since Last Hydrostatic Test At Time of Leak	107
Table 4-22	Spill Size Distribution	109
Table 4-22A	Spill Size Distribution	110
Table 4-23	Property Damage Distribution	112
Table 4-24	Stress Level Distribution	115
Table 4-25	Injuries By Year of Study	116
Table 4-25A	Fatalities By Year of Study	117
Table 5-1	Seismic Leak Summary	126
Table 5-2	Seismic Event Summary	127
Table 5-2A	Pipe Density By County	128

California State Fire Marshal

March 1993

Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Risk Assessment



Table 5-2B	Estimated Pipe Lengths Exposed to Various MMI	130
Table 5-2C	Seismic Incident Rates	131
Table 5-3	Annual Occurrence Rate For California Earthquakes	133
Table 5-4	Empirical Areas Exposed to Various Modified Mercalli Intensities	136
Table 5-4A	30 Year Estimate of California Earthquakes	136
Table 5-4B	Seismic Incident Estimates - Scenario 1	139
Table 5-4C	Seismic Incident Estimates - Scenario 2	140
Table 5-4D	Seismic Incident Estimates - Scenario 3	141
Table 6-5A	Average Valve Spacing Distribution	151
Table 6-5B	Potential Drain Down Length Distribution	151
Table 6-5C	Spill Size Distribution	153
Table 6-5D	Distribution of Spill Volumes	153
Table 6-5E	Spill Size Versus Drain Down Length	156
Table 6-5F	Spill Size Versus Drain Down Length - Normalized Data	157
Table 6-6A	Cost Benefit Ratios - All Regulated Lines	160
Table 6-6B	Cost Benefit Ratios - Individual Line Segments	160

Exhibit 1 - Acknowledgements